

Governor's Upper Yellowstone River Task Force
PUBLIC MEETING SESSION
Meeting Transcripts
May 6, 2003
Yellowstone Motor Inn
Meeting began at 7:00 p.m.

I. Introductions

Members Present:

John Bailey, Chair
Roy Aserlind
Andy Dana
Doug Ensign

Dave Haug
Jerry O'Hair
Brant Oswald
Ed Schilling

Rod Siring
Bob Wiltshire
Jim Woodhull

Ron Archuleta, USFS Ex-Officio
Ken Britton, USFS Ex-Officio
Robert Ray, DEQ Ex-Officio

Laurence Siroky, DNRC Ex-Officio
Allan Steinle, Corps Ex-Officio

Others Present:

Liz Galli-Noble, Coordinator
Kelly Wade, Secretary
Jim Barrett
Karl Biastoch
Scott Bosse
Steve Caldwell
Mike Dettori
Tom Hallin
Eric Hastings

Bob Jockers
George Jordan
Catherine Lane Mejia
Tom Lane Sr.
Jason Lehmann
Peter Mackenzie
Bill Moser
Tom Pick

Franklin Rigler
Jim Robinson
Bernard Rustad
Daryl Smith
Nelson Story
Ted Watson
Robert White
Burt Williams
Tom Lane Jr.

II. Public Meeting (Listening Session)

John Bailey: We are basically having two meetings tonight. We're having a public forum first, and after that is over, provided it's not too late, we will go into a formal Task Force meeting. So the beginning of this meeting is called a Public Listening Session. The rules for the meeting are, and these rules basically came at our last meeting, mostly suggested by the people asking for this meeting. I just want to give this out, because some of you may think we're being restrictive as a Task Force, but we certainly wanted everyone to have a chance to come and speak. We're going to ask the speakers to line up behind the microphone. We need each speaker to state their name, please. All of the statements tonight are going to be recorded and written out; so we have a written record so anyone, and even Task Force members, because if we started working on recommendations, we may need to go back and look at various things that were said. It is all going to be written, so we want to make sure we have your name there. Each speaker will be allowed three minutes. A yellow card will be held at the two-minute mark, a red card will be held at the three-minute mark, and you'll be given 10 seconds to finish, at which time I'll ask for the next speaker. That's basically it.

I want to make one comment about one flyer that went out, and there were several people, and we appreciate people putting out information about this meeting, but one flyer said "the last chance you'll have to make your opinions known before the Task Force makes its final recommendations to Governor Martz later this summer." And I have to disagree with that. All our meetings are open to the public, and in all our meetings we ask for comments and opinions from the public. We're moving from the type of meetings we've been having, into a final process. There are some new people here tonight, and I just want to clarify that there are three steps in the final process. One, we'll be having

a general discussion. At our last meeting we got the final science report in, so now we have to try to take and digest the science and come up with recommendations. There's going to be a general discussion area, where the Task Force will talk amongst themselves, the Task Force members will speak first, and when they have no further comments, members of the public will be asked for their comments. At the end of a meeting, or at different times, depending on how the discussion goes, we'll move into a Step 2, which will be the Task Force actually making recommendations and then seeing if we can get consensus. There is really no discussion in that process. If we fail to get consensus, we will be then moving back into a number 1 Step. So again, the public would have input. Once we've moved from all that, there is a Number 3 [Step], and when we move to Number 3, we're going to take all the recommendations we've made, and try to make that mesh. Some of those may be amended, adjusted, and when we move into Step 3, there will be no more further input from the public at one of our meetings. However, the public is allowed, and we encourage you, to send us written comments, or to speak with one of the Task Force members about different concerns. All we'll be doing in Step 3 is reviewing recommendations that have been set forth in previous meetings because we suspect that, as we're talking about a subject, we're going to be talking about bank stabilization, permit, or various things, that we're going to have conflicting recommendations that we'll have to mesh. We're not quite sure, we have to get there, but there will be a final, and at that point, your ways of communicating with us will be written comments or dealing directly with a Task Force member. I just want you to know that our whole process has been open, we've gotten a great deal of input from the public, it's been very welcome, and it's been a very important part of this long process. So now, I would like to open it up to the first speaker.

Bob Wiltshire: I would just also like to reiterate that this is a session for the Task Force to hear the public and that this is in no way, shape, or form anything beyond the Task Force hearing the public. This has nothing to do with the Corps' need at some point to solicit public input, or anything to do with the NEPA process. I'd like you to keep that in mind.

John Bailey: First speaker, please.

Tom Lane: I'm a rancher down here on the Yellowstone River. When this Task Force first met, it seemed to me that it was the idea that, because the fish population disappeared, and one thing and another, there was a lot of debris in the river, a lot of focus on the ranchers, and because they were putting in streambank stabilizations, and putting in barbs, and putting all those different things in. The last thing I did in here was I said that the fish population is more than it's ever been. I just come back from eastern Montana down there, been down there for about 30 days. The scarcity of wildlife down there is surprising, hardly any birds, I never seen a magpie, I never seen a crow, never seen one eagle, never seen any, seen one hawk, there's no blackbirds. And, here, I can see more wildlife down here along the river on our property than I could down there in six weeks. So, to think that the rancher, because he went out there and stabilized his banks, because we had a cataclysmic event back in 1996 and 1997, and the land holders response, which are the changes in the river all that time, I think you're way off base. It was suggested at the time that we first started this thing here, that you want the river to flow in ribbons, and one thing and another, but at that time all the channels got plugged up with debris, which was coming down the river and mark them sandbars and one thing and another, which changed the course the river which we had nothing to do with at all. It was suggested maybe a little money could be spent on cleaning up them side channels so the river would have a chance to spread in case we did have a flood. Of course that said, we haven't had any high water. And another thing, I see in some of your literature you're saying well there's more revenue built between tourism and wildlife and one thing and another than the ranching community and the farming community, which I have a damn hard time to believe. When they wanted a donation for the school down there, our family donated \$65,000. Nobody said no you can't donate because you're a dirty rancher. Same thing when they wanted \$5,000 for the library, they didn't say no you can't donate because you're a rancher, you're denuding the property out here, you're raising

hell with the environment. Nobody said anything about that. Nobody said we couldn't come to town and buy all our produce here, and our fuel, and pay taxes, pay taxes to beat hell. And we're ranching, we're not out there trying to denude the landscape, we're not trying to change the river, we're trying to make a living along with everybody else. A little cooperation between all the environmentalists and the ranchers, would come to a hell of a lot more than what's been done here in the last three, four, five, or six years. You guys come out and say no we got to do this, you got to do that. I mean because if you're trying to do, you're trying to come up with some format, that one-size-fits-all, which will never work because the changes in the river were not because of what the rancher done, it was because what mother nature done. And to think we can't protect ourselves and protect our property against that, you got the Department of Environmental Quality, you got the DNRC, you've got the County Commissioners, you got the planners, you got the City Planners, you got everything else to protect that river. We're not going to go in here and do anything, you can't get enough 310 permits, you've got the U.S. Army Engineers come in, you got Fish and Wildlife, stuff like that, and I know that there's been nothing done that we've done in the past 40 years since we've been here that ever harmed anything, we never harmed any wildlife, we never harmed any fish, never harmed any deer. We've got more deer, we've got more geese, more ducks, more wildlife than we all seen when we first come here.

John Bailey: Tom... Thank you.

Scott Bosse: I'm the Rivers Conservation Coordinator for the Greater Yellowstone Coalition. And I just wanted to start out by thanking all of you for opening this process to the public with a special listening session tonight. I really appreciate your targeting our interests. I just want to start out by telling you a little bit where I come from, not just the Greater Yellowstone Coalition. For the last five years, I was working in the Columbia Basin, trying to restore salmon and steelhead to some of their historic habitat. And for those of you that don't know, the federal government is spending roughly a billion dollars a year right now trying to restore fish runs in the Columbia Basin. It's a very expensive process, and the one thing I've learned from it is that it is a heck of a lot easier to protect the river when it's still intact than it is to restore it, resurrect it, once it's been trashed. The Columbia Basin, the Columbia River and the lower Snake River, have been heavily degraded and we're probably never going to restore those resources to the point where we'd like to see them; and I hope we don't let the Yellowstone fall prey to the same forces. You don't even have to travel that far to see how out-of-control floodplain development can destroy rivers. If you go to the area around Jackson Hole, Wyoming, along the Snake River, that section of the river is so heavily leveed now that it's riparian cottonwood forest is no longer regenerating, it's trout populations have dropped significantly since the 1950s when the Corps of Engineers built a system of levees there. And now the Corps is spending \$66,500,000 in federal taxpayer money trying to restore that section of river to a semblance of its former health. I think that we here in Park County have the opportunity to avoid making that same mistake that they made on the Snake River by Jackson Hole, and I hope we seize that opportunity. I know a lot of you aren't big fans of regulation, regulatory methods to protect the Yellowstone River. I don't think anyone is a big fan of regulation, but I think what other counties in Montana and throughout the western states are starting to find out is, if we simply allow people to continue to build where they want to build, our rivers are going to be overrun with development. We would like to see the Task Force recommend to Park County, and to the Army Corps of Engineers in its SAMP, that there be no more development allowed in the 100-year flood plain, no more bank stabilization along the Yellowstone River, and no more flood control structures, with a big caveat, because we do have to balance public resources with private property rights. That caveat is: any existing structures along the Upper Yellowstone River should be grand-fathered in. No one has the right to tell you that, if you have a home along the Yellowstone River and you can't protect it when a flood comes. I'm not telling you that. But I think that at some point we need to close the door, and stop the bleeding. If we're going to pass this river on to future generations, in the same condition that we enjoy it today, we're going to have to stop the bleeding sometime. A lot of counties

throughout Montana are taking action. Madison County has a 500-foot development setback to protect the Madison River, Beaverhead County has a 300-foot setback, Bighorn County has a 300-foot setback. There are many, many examples, and I hope you are not scared from taking bold measures to protect this great resource. Thanks.

Bill Moser: I'm a freeholder from Pray. Thank you for allowing us three minutes to address all our concerns. I begin by placing in the record my notice of how this public meeting was announced on very short notice to the readers of your own e-mail list and subscribers and to readers of the Enterprise and really not much of anyone else. And I stipulate you place in the record of this session all the post offices, groceries, restaurants, businesses, etc., and in which towns, where you noticed the general public of this event. And now you're going to intend to portray to the Governor and the public that their chance to communicate, although in reality they were kept in ignorance of the event, which is scheduled concurrently with not one, but two, fire prevention open houses effecting basically the same constituent populations. Deuteronomy 25.4 would call this "the muzzling of the mouth of the ox that treadeth out of the rain."

Tonight I had hoped to address my deep concerns that the Hobbs Well and Montana Power Company may in fact be not only draining the Mammoth Hot Springs and other areas of Yellowstone Park, but could also be building a steam pocket under the Upper Yellowstone Valley, which could ultimately blow away the Yellowstone River Basin, in a fashion not unlike how the opening of an operating pressure cooker blasts the contents of that cooker all over the kitchen. I do not feel that three minutes can begin to properly address this concern, so I stipulate that any written document that I provide you on this subject is hereby made part of this testimony of this public record, which you are collecting and transcribing, unedited and undeleted, into the final record of the Task Force. I mentioned several times over the last few months that there are three, not one, rivers in and under the Upper Yellowstone Basin. The middle elevation river has for years been tapped at the old Chico dredge and could be effectively and economically used to offset local water shortage problems generated by droughts. Since none of your scientific studies have identified who actually owns the truly crucial floodplain lands, we must speculate that ranchers own the vast majority of the floodplain land. The most economical and practical way to preserve the natural, unconstructed nature and flood plain, is to preserve the ranches that contain these lands, even if this means subsidizing those ranches. The most economical and natural way to subsidize these ranches is to increase the amount of irrigation water, and thus their output per unit area out of the ranches that contain the crucial floodplain lands. Over half a year ago, I sent a brief letter concerning tapping the dredge for irrigation and drought purposes to the DEQ and Task Force. The Task Force Chairman blocked the dissemination of this letter to the general Task Force membership, and the DEQ has never acknowledged that they received it. This leads me to the conclusion that you're not really looking for solutions to any of the problem of human and river interactions. Therefore, I stipulate that a copy of my November 6, 2002 letter be included as part of these comments. Simultaneously, I point out that all communications I've sent you have offered positive suggestions and solutions. The duress of your adopted studies have been, from the outset, designed....

John Bailey: Bill, you're way over three minutes.

Jim Barrett: I represent the Park County Environmental Council, about 350 people in Park County who are concerned about the health and future of the Yellowstone River and the lands that border it, and so on. I was trying to rack my brain to come up with some recommendations that, after five and a half years, that I could check off a list and say "Here's what you guys need to tell the Governor," and I haven't been able to come up with anything. I mean I've heard some things that Scott Bosse said about floodplain setbacks, etc., which are certainly a viable outcome of any kind of discussions about managing a river; certainly that's kind of a no-brainer. I think anybody here would agree with that. But I think that what I ultimately have come to the conclusion that, tonight, after the last scientific presentation, tonight is actually the beginning of the work of the Task Force, and I

commend you people for over five and a half years. I didn't make it to all the meetings, and I know that there's a few of you in here that did and that's a very commendable achievement. But tonight is the beginning of the Task Force, and now that we've all been educated, now that we've all had a, we understand a little better how the river functions, we understand a little better the ramifications of certain activities, humans, human incursions upon the river and so on. It's now, after we've, with all that knowledge, now it's time to formulate a vision, formulate a vision of a desired future outcome, a desired future condition of the Yellowstone River Corridor. What does that look like? What does that look like as far as riparian habitat, side channels, fish habitat, cottonwood forests, what do the banks look like, what does the development scenario look like, when someone is floating down the river, you know, all those sorts of things? What is the vision, what are we looking for? Then, we can look at that future vision, or what, and basically it is what it looks like right now for the most part. Then, how do we develop a management situation, a protocol if you will, to ensure that that vision is retained, that that desired future outcome, or desired future condition, is retained? How do we do that? I think that's where, the Task Force, now and in the next four months, is supposed to come up with all these recommendations and pass them on to the Governor, and hey, we've solved that problem, but that's not going to happen. Certainly not by looking at a list of issues that have been created and go one by one and suddenly look at barbs, for example, like we will tonight, and come up with a recommendation. Well, what will that recommendation be? Length of barb, placement of barb, the real question should be "why is the barb being placed there?" And the final thing would be, is if you could recommend something to the Governor, would be to have the Governor create a special, a designated status for the Yellowstone River. It's a special place, has a myriad of values for a lot of different people, and it's a special river, and it certainly deserves special consideration. Thank you very much.

Karl Biastoch: I came up here to clarify a point that I made in a written statement earlier. The river, in the anabranching or the braided areas, unconfined, where it's slow, and spreads out. In the graduate courses in hydrology and other things that I've done, they had this lecture about what happens on a sandbar wave action, because these waves go over the top of it and you get these mini-waves of material moving across the sandbar. And these things just build up and build up. These same things happen in a river, only they're not quite so easy to identify because of other things, the narrowing of the river and confinements and things like that; but they still have, you'd have waves of material move down through the river. When they get into certain spots, you get the right amount of water coming over, they will spill over the bank, and that's why you get these side channels and braiding forming, because of this. Well, in this area from Pine Creek down through here, we have the same thing, but they used the measurement at Carter's Bridge because it is the most stable spot because of the confinement due to the bridge abutments, increases the velocity and decreases the wavelength, or increases the wavelength, decreases the amplitude, which makes the bottom more stable and you do not see this. One of the reasons they didn't put the USGS Mission Site there is because it was, they went downstream, and had three to five foot variations in the bottom over time, which makes it very hard to, how much water is coming down the river. Thank you.

Eric Hastings: I'm a landowner about 18 miles south of here, and you know what, John [Bailey], I don't appreciate you threatening me sitting there. And that's the way I interpreted it, and if this is the sort of a meeting that you operate, I can understand why people might be a little bit upset with your process. I've lived in Bozeman since 1998; this is the first time I've even been aware of a public meeting on the Yellowstone River. It wouldn't take a Rhodes scholar to figure out who owns property next to the Yellowstone River. I'm not certain why you couldn't have figured that out from public records and sent each one of us a notice, or why it wouldn't have been more publicly accessible to us. But what I would really prefer from you is that you not threaten me as I sit there at the first time at a new meeting.

John Bailey: I'm sorry. Any further speakers?

Tom Lane: Can we add something to what we already said?

John Bailey: Well, I'm not sure. Usually in Livingston people are not reluctant to speak.

Tom Lane: I thought of two things that I forgot when I was up there, but if the time's up, the time's up.

John Bailey: Any other speakers?

Ted Watson: John, I have a question. We, at any time, can give written info to the Task Force, can't we?

John Bailey: Yes.

Ted Watson: Thank you.

Frank Rigler: Can we pass our time to Tom Lane?

John Bailey: I don't know that we have a policy on that. There's a lot of new faces here, and I think it would be a great opportunity for the Task Force to hear from people.

Tom Lane: Can we question one of the speakers that was up here before? I'd like to question that fellow from the Greater Yellowstone Coalition. Can I do that?

John Bailey: Well, I'm not against that, but I would like to at least let everyone who wants to speak, speak. Some people thought there were going to be lots of speakers tonight, and so far it looks like a few. Any more speakers? Okay, Tom? We need people speaking in the microphone please, so we, we want to make sure we have a record.

Tom Lane: I don't know the fellow from the Greater Yellowstone Coalition, but he sounded like he was trying to compare the Yellowstone River with the Snake River, I presume, down in Idaho. But anyway, it seemed like when he said they trashed the river down there, but don't we have enough safeguards here on the local level to protect the kind of development he's talking about? I mean, why do we have the Department of Environmental Quality, why do we have the Department of Natural Resources, why do we have the Corps of Army Engineers, why do we have the Fish and Wildlife Department, why do we have the city planners and all those things, except that they're to provide the safeguards to protect the river as we know it? There's no way that anybody can go in there now and put in a stream stabilization without going through all the hoops, and the thing about it is, is I remember it seemed like this Task Force was just in the middle of getting a moratorium put on any stream bank regulations, and as luck would have it, there's been no high water in the last five years, four years, five years. But anyway, when you lose local control, things go to pot, and when you get all these government regulations on there that say "you gotta do this, you gotta do that", they're going to come down hard on the cattle ranchers, because they're saying that well now, you've got cattle close to the river and you may be spreading too much manure and you're doing this and you're doing that, and stuff like that. And as if we don't have enough problems the way it is; like you say, we're not going down there, there's nobody going into the flood plain that, I don't think you could come in here with it, for the county regulations that you've got today, and building anything in the flood plain unless it's been okayed by somebody, maybe three or four different organizations. And to say that no more stream banks, no more stabilizations, no more of this, and that the other thing, and someone mentioned here about the stream being able to meander along, no one has ever

suggested that we go in there and pull out the debris in all those side channels where the river can expand, and not do any damage, not do any harm. Nobody has ever suggested that. It was brought up here the first time we met, why not unplug the side channel and let the river spread like it's supposed to? Then you'd have all this rejuvenation of cottonwood trees and sandbars and everything else everybody is talking about. Anyway, I hope that this fellow from the Greater Yellowstone Coalition doesn't think because we live along the river here we're going to try to trash it. That isn't our agenda at all. Our livelihood depends on it, and the Shields River depends on it, and if you take the water away from the ranches and farmers here, you got nothing. Your community is going to go downhill, just like it did down in, out there in California, where they took the water away and the thing dried up till there's nothing left. Anyway, talk about, they'd like to have a free-flowing river, who wouldn't? But where the hell are all the people going to? I'm going to list all the stuff that others didn't. I think there's got to be some common sense brought into this problem and I'm glad to have a chance to do so. Thank you.

Scott Bosse: Thanks for your comments and Tom, I don't know you either, but I'm not saying anyone that lives along the banks of the Yellowstone River is trying to trash it. As a matter of fact, I think the Yellowstone River is remarkably intact. I'm not here to say that we're in a crisis and we need to restore it. I'm saying, let's protect it the way we have it now. And I started giving you folks some examples of some things that other counties have done in Montana; and I just want to spend another minute or two giving you some further examples. Idaho is, not arguably, it is the most conservative state in the United States politically. It's not known for its progressive environmental record. I lived there for a long, long time; I can tell you that. However, our neighbors to the south have a state-protected rivers bill that prohibits all stream bank alterations on 2,000 miles of rivers in Idaho—2,000 miles. That includes the Henry's Fork, the South Fork of the Snake, the whole Payette system, the whole Boise River system, the St. Joe system. This is not a leftie-greenie state we're talking about here. This is a state that looked at its natural resources and said, "This is the goose that's laying our golden eggs. We ought to protect it." Idaho has taken some dramatic, bold actions that I think are having a very real, a positive effect on their rivers. As I was saying, there are other counties in Montana that have instituted floodplain ordinances in recent years that I think very reasonably balance private property rights and public values. Missoula County passed a floodplain ordinance just two years ago that all but bans structural development in the 100-year flood plain on its rivers. Ravalli County, on the Bitterroot River, did the same thing. Madison County passed an ordinance that establishes a 500-foot setback along the Madison River. Beaverhead County has a 300-foot setback on the Beaverhead River. You may have just read in the *Billings Gazette* that Bighorn County just issued a moratorium on development within 300 feet of the Bighorn River. There are examples all over the place. Gallatin County this summer is probably going to approve the floodplain ordinance that's going to be the most progressive in the West. So, there are many, many places in Montana, and around Montana, that are recognizing the contributions that rivers make to the local economies and their quality of life; and all that we ask you, we being the people that are members of the Greater Yellowstone Coalition, and people that really care about the Yellowstone River, and I think we all do, is that let's protect the great thing that we have now. If we don't take action now, if we don't take action after five years of studies and three million some dollars spent, the river is not going to take care of itself. There's an article recently about the county planner in Madison County and they asked her why did Madison County institute a 500-foot setback along the Madison River? And she said, "Well, at first the county commissioners thought that if we just, you know, let people use their common sense, they wouldn't build houses along the river, but it didn't turn out that way." A lot of people that are moving to the banks of the Yellowstone River, they don't know any better, they love this river and they love the fisheries. They're not trying to destroy them, but they don't know any better. I think it is up to the local people here to protect what's in our own backyard.

Ted Watson: I ranch along the Yellowstone River. Scott, thank you for the information about Madison County and the setbacks. Would you please then, in writing, provide to the commission the number of variances that Madison County has granted in the last five years? Thank you.

Franklin J. Rigler: For the record, two years ago I was the only guy, only fisherman around that wouldn't sign a petition for prescribed burns in Yellowstone. Now, regardless if we're supposed to do it locally here, the burns, according to Greater Yellowstone Coalition, are the greatest things to ever happen in Yellowstone, it didn't affect the Yellowstone River at all. The snowflake doesn't know the difference between a clearcut, like if the Forest Service clearcut a drainage like Yellowstone Park, like what burned in Yellowstone Park, what would happen? Would the Greater Yellowstone Coalition say anything? I think they would. But if we could keep this locally, we would have a river, but we won't have a river as long as Yellowstone Park controls what's happening in Yellowstone. The wolves demise the elk, but they'll never demise the buffalo. The buffalo will be there; there won't be any willow or any aspen. All you people are familiar with Elk Park, and I mentioned this two years ago when Tom Lane left that night, or the day after. My family went to Yellowstone years ago, in 1919, and they got to Elk Park, and at Elk Park, the reason we're talking about Elk Park, it was solid willows and solid beaver dams. The next time you go to Elk Park, and this whole group should go up to Elk Park tomorrow, you're going to see the remnants of old beaver dams, there isn't a willow left. Unless you have the Yellowstone River in its natural condition, which it won't be, when we have the next big fire, Mr. Bailey, it'll just burn everything and all that fuel is there. And then you'll see a flood. Those other little floods in 1996 and 1997 were nothing. But all you educated people sit down and talk about setbacks; I fenced my Yellowstone property off the river last year, not because of cattle, because the weeds were coming down. Years and years ago I went to a conservation meeting in Yellowstone and John Varley got up and said, talked about it, and he was standing on Dalmation Toadflax, Spotted Knapweed and Hounds Tongue. He said, "Oh Rigler, you got more Hounds Tongue down on your place than Yellowstone Park," he said, "I'll bet you". I said, "I'll bet you \$10,000, John Varley." But that's a problem. If you can't control the headwaters, you'll never control the Yellowstone. Thank you.

John Bailey: Further comments? Any comments from the Task Force?

Andy Dana: I guess I'd just like to invite the gentleman who's here for the first time, thank you for coming, and if you have some observations about the Yellowstone, we'd like to hear them. If anybody else in the audience too, rather than, we're not perfect, it's not a perfect process, but we'd like to hear what you have to say, if you have any...

Eric Hastings: I'm just so remarkably ignorant, I wouldn't possibly get up here and say anything relevant with regard to the Yellowstone. Ed Schilling knows the extent of my ignorance. He's done some work for me on my property before he was a commissioner. It's just that I resented the attitude by your Chair, and I thought maybe I'd just speak out about it, because I thought, if that's the way the rest of the process was working, maybe it wasn't working adequately. And certainly I've been aware of the Governor's Task Force, as it has continued, but as far as the meeting and the process and everything else, I found out about this through the Greater Yellowstone Coalition.

John Bailey: No further discussion? Task Force? Then we'll adjourn this part and in five minutes we'll open a regular Task Force meeting. Thank you.